

Please note, these transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
SPECIAL WASTE AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING  
1001 I STREET  
2ND FLOOR  
COASTAL HEARING ROOM  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2003  
9:30 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jose Medina, Chairperson

Steven Jones

Michael Paparian

Carl Washington

STAFF

Mark Leary, Executive Director

Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Kathryn Tobias, Chief Counsel

Patty Wohl, Deputy Director

Jim Lee, Deputy Director

Steve Boyd

Keith Cambridge

Boxing Chen

Linda Dickinson

Don Dier

Glenn Gallagher

Nate Gauff

Martha Gildart

Jan Howard

Laurie Karlstad

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF

Raffy Kouyoumdjian

Robertta Kunisaki

Jim La Tanner

Kellie Messenger

Bill Orr

David Volden

Elena Yates

ALSO PRESENT

Dan Burgess, Electronics Partners Corporation

Bill Krauss, The APEX Group

Randy Pollack, Soap and Detergent Association

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

## INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
A. Special Waste Deputy Director's Report	2
B. Consideration Of The Grant Awards For The Waste Tire Track And Other Recreational Surfacing Grant Program For FY 2002/2003 -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item B And March Board Item 1)	7
Motion	12
Vote	12
C. Consideration Of Proposed Applicant Eligibility, Project Eligibility, Scoring Criteria, And Evaluation Process For The Local Government Public Education And Amnensty Day Grant Program, FY 2003/2004 -- (March Board Item 2)	12
Motion	61
Vote	61
D. Consideration Of The Grant Awards For The Waste Tire Enforcement Grant Programs For FY 2002/2003 -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item C And March Board Item 3)	31
Motion	44
Vote	45
E. Consideration Of The Scoring Criteria And Evaluation Process For The FY 2003/2004 Household Hazardous Waste Grants -- (March Board Item 4)	46
Motion	50
Vote	50
F. Consideration Of Contractor For The Evaluation Of The Northern And Southern California Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Technology Centers Contract (Tire Recycling Management Fund, FY 2002/2003) -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item D And March Board Item 5)	50
Motion	54
Vote	55

## INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
G. Consideration Of Adoption Of Revisions To The Existing Waste Tire Hauler Registration And Manifesting Regulations -- (March Board Item 6)	55
Motion	57
Vote	59
H. PULLED Discussion And Request For Direction On Developing A Revised Five-Year Plan For The Waste Tire Management Program -- (March Board Item 7)	6
I. Waste Prevention And Market Development Deputy Director's Report	62
J. Consideration Of The Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application For Golden By-Products, Inc. d.b.a. Scrap Tire Company -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item E And March Board Item 8)	63
Motion	67
Vote	68
K. Consideration Of The Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application For Electronics Partners Corporation, Inc. -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item F And March Board Item 9)	68
Motion	70
Vote	70
L. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The Oroville Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 10)	72
Motion	72
Vote	73
M. PULLED Consideration Of The Application To Renew The Agua Mansa Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 11)	6
N. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The Merced County Regional Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 12)	73
Motion	73
Vote	74

## INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
O. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The South San Diego Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 13)	74
Motion	75
Vote	75
P. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The Long Beach Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 14)	74
Motion	75
Vote	75
Q. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The City of Los Angeles Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 15)	74
Motion	75
Vote	75
R. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The Contra Costa Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (March Board Item 16)	74
Motion	75
Vote	75
S. Consideration Of The Scope Of Work For The RecycleStore Marketing Services Contract (FY 2002/2003 Contract Concept #14) -- (Board Item 17)	76
Motion	79
Vote	80

## INDEX CONTINUED

## PAGE

T. Consideration Of Completion Of 1997-1999 Rigid Plastic Packaging Container (RPPC) Compliance Agreements For The Following Companies: (1) Acuity Brands, Inc. (Formerly Zep Manufacturing Company); (2) Alto U.S., Incorporated; (3) Athea Laboratories, Incorporated; (4) Campbell Hausfeld; (5) Chemical Specialties Manufacturing (Chem Spec); (6) Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., Automotive Division; (7) CRC Industries, Incorporated; (8) Diversey Lever; (9) Eclectic Products, Incorporated; (10) Emerson & Cuming, Incorporated; (11) Endar Corporation; (12) Foam Seal Incorporated; (13) Gardner Bender; (14) Homax Products Company; (15) John Deere Consumer Products, Incorporated; (16) Lundmark Wax Company; (17) Oil-Chem Research Corporation; (18) Orange Glo International Incorporated; (19) Schrader-Bridgeport International, Incorporated; (20) Sierra International Incorporated; (21) Sunbeam Corporation; (22) Three Bond International, Incorporated; And (23) Turtle Wax, Incorporated -- (March Board Item 18)	80
Motion	80
Vote	81
U. Consideration Of Adoption Of Emergency Regulations Regarding Assessment Of Administrative Civil Penalties Against Product Manufacturers For Non-compliance With The Rigid Plastic Packaging Container (RPPC) Law -- (March Board Item 19)	81
V. Consideration Of The Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Task Force Charter, Pursuant To Assembly Bill 498 (Chan, Chapter 575, Statutes of 2002) -- (March Board Item 20)	83
Motion	83
Vote	84
Public Comment	84
Adjournment	84
Reporter's Certificate	85

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Good morning. This meeting is called to order.

This is a meeting of the Special Waste and Market Development Committee. Today's March the 11th, 2003.

Please turn off your cell phones and pagers or put them on vibrating mode.

Ms. Harris, if you'd call the roll please.

SECRETARY HARRIS: Jones?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Here.

SECRETARY HARRIS: Paparian?

COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Here.

SECRETARY HARRIS: Washington?

COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Here.

SECRETARY HARRIS: Medina?

CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Here.

Ex partes, members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Tim Shestak and Randy Pollack.

I think that's it, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I'm up to date.

CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board member Paparian.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'm up to date.

CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: And I have one. Just Sean



1 Edgar on the state of Elk Grove.

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: At this point I'll turn it  
4 over to Deputy Director of Special Waste, Jim Lee.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman Medina,  
6 members of the Committee.

7 On March 7th we held a Special Waste Committee  
8 Workshop on development of the revised five-year plan for  
9 the Waste Tire Management Program.

10 Revised budget allocations for various program  
11 elements were discussed. Public testimony was received.  
12 A tentative agreement was reached on a budget for Fiscal  
13 Year '03-'04 and '04-'05, which reconciles proposed  
14 allocations with expenditure authority.

15 Another workshop has been scheduled for March  
16 24th to continue these discussions, to reach agreement on  
17 a balanced budget for Fiscal Years through '07-'08.

18 As I mentioned earlier, our discussion at this  
19 next meeting will be held on March the 24th.

20 In other matters, during the month of February,  
21 Board staff and the CHP conducted two roadside check  
22 points. The operation at the Yolo County Central Landfill  
23 yielded no violations.

24 The operation as C.D. Tires, a tire collection  
25 center in San Bernardino County, had somewhat different

1 results. Every vehicle stopped had some sort of  
2 violation, ranging from being an unregistered hauler to  
3 having the decals placed in the wrong location in the  
4 vehicle.

5 Check point operations will continue, with  
6 hopefully even more than a two per month being scheduled  
7 in the coming months.

8 This summer it is our intent to evaluate the  
9 results of our first year efforts to see how we can better  
10 tailor the program to meet needs.

11 Last month I reported that Total Tire Recycling  
12 had ceased their operations here in Sacramento. Staff had  
13 requested a plan from TTR on how they're going to deal  
14 with the tires left at their yard and tire collection  
15 points all over northern California. We've gotten a reply  
16 from TTR indicating that they will have all tires removed  
17 from their site in Sacramento by the middle of the month,  
18 and by the middle of May will have either removed all of  
19 the tires from their collection points or will have made  
20 arrangements with other companies to take over these  
21 accounts.

22 On a somewhat more upbeat note, the Used Oil  
23 Branch is very pleased to announce that we have  
24 successfully recruited three new staff from the SROA list.  
25 Our new supervising IWMS for grants and certification will

1 start on March 24th. We have two new IWMS staff  
2 positions. Staff will begin work in the grant section on  
3 April 1st.

4 I'd like to kind of take this opportunity again  
5 to thank personnel from -- staff from the Personnel  
6 Office, in particular Kellie Messenger and Laurie  
7 Karlstad, for their efforts in helping us to fill these  
8 vacancies expeditiously. We do very much appreciate that.

9 And unless there's any questions from the  
10 Committee, that concludes my report for today.

11 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Very good. Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Jones.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Just a quick question,  
15 Mr. Lee.

16 If a landfill or a MRF transfer station gets --  
17 other than the four or five that could be mixed into a  
18 commercial garbage load -- but I mean gets a load of  
19 tires, and nobody's got a manifest or anything, if they  
20 contact the Waste Board to figure it out, is there some  
21 kind of running list to make sure that those questions are  
22 being answered or that there's some kind of a direction to  
23 those landfills what to do next with these people that are  
24 bringing in tires? And I ask because a couple people have  
25 said they've been getting, you know, some loads that come

1 in and they've called, and they weren't sure what the  
2 follow-up was, you know. And I'm just wondering.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Mr. Jones, maybe Don Dier  
4 of my staff can respond to that question.

5 MR. DIER: Yeah, Don Dier with the Waste Tire  
6 Enforcement Program.

7 We do get reports from landfills and waste tire  
8 facilities. What we ask is that they go ahead -- if they  
9 get an unmanifested load that they go ahead and accept the  
10 load. But then they're required to keep a log of the  
11 vehicle information, the license plate, make and model, a  
12 description of the vehicle. And that's transmitted to us  
13 on a monthly basis. And then we follow-up with that. We  
14 follow-up and go after those people to get them  
15 registered. And if they're recalcitrant, then we'll  
16 initiate enforcement actions.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. If the same  
18 people are delivering maybe using rental trucks or  
19 something which would have different license numbers, is  
20 there something that they should be doing I mean as far as  
21 getting drivers license numbers or something to try to pin  
22 these guys down?

23 MR. DIER: Well, all we're requiring them to do  
24 now is to note the vehicle information and send it to us.  
25 And then it really shifts the burden to us to take that

1 action. We aren't putting that much on the operators  
2 themselves at the facilities.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. They were -- I  
4 guess that's been going on, and they appreciate that.  
5 They're just wondering what their next steps might have to  
6 be. So that's cool.

7 Thanks, Mr. Chair.

8 MR. DIER: We would like them to keep us  
9 informed, especially with repeat offenders. We have had  
10 difficulties, and some of our CHP check points have noted  
11 this, about the lack of good record keeping on the part of  
12 some operators with regard to unmanifested and  
13 unregistered haulers.

14 And we're working on that too with the operators.  
15 So we've got issues with not only the haulers, but  
16 sometimes the operators to make sure they're reporting  
17 properly.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Great.

19 Thanks, Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Okay. With that, as we  
21 begin the agenda, I just want to say that Item H, which is  
22 March Board Item Number 7, has been pulled, as has Item M,  
23 which is March Board Item Number 11. Those 2 items have  
24 been pulled.

25 And with that we'll proceed with the rest of the

1 agenda.

2 First item please.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman Medina.

4 The first item for the Committee's consideration  
5 is Committee Item B, consideration of the grant awards for  
6 the Waste Tire Track and Other Recreational Surfacing  
7 Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2002-2003.

8 Elena Yates will make the staff presentation.

9 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
10 Presented as follows.)

11 MS. YATES: Good morning, Committee Chair and  
12 Board members. I am Elena Yates from the Waste Tire  
13 Diversion Section of the Special Waste Division.

14 This presentation is for Committee Item B,  
15 consideration of the grant awards for the Waste Tire Track  
16 and Other Recreational Surfacing Grant Program for Fiscal  
17 Year 2002-2003.

18 Attachment 1 presents the criteria for this grant  
19 cycle. Attachments 2 and 3 provides the north and south  
20 split in descending order for passing and failing  
21 applications. Attachment 4 provides project descriptions  
22 for projects with passing scores. Attachment 5 os the  
23 resolution and lists the 21 projects recommended for  
24 funding.

25 The five-year plan approved by the Board at its

1 March 2001 meeting designated \$1 million to fund the Waste  
2 Tire Track and Other recreational Surfacing Grant Program  
3 for five fiscal years beginning in Fiscal Year '01-'02.

4 This item is its second cycle under the five-year  
5 plan.

6 --o0o--

7 MS. YATES: The Board received 31 grant  
8 applications requesting more than \$2.7 million in funding.

9 Staff is recommending that the Board approve  
10 Option 1 and award funds to the 11 applicants that passed  
11 the grant-reaching process, for a combined total of \$1  
12 million in funding as indicated in resolution number  
13 2003-146.

14 To utilize the entire current allocation for this  
15 program, staff recommends fully funding ten applications  
16 and partially funding one application. Staff recommends  
17 that the Board approve the ranking of the ten remaining  
18 passing applicants. Staff is requesting approval to enter  
19 into grant agreements with the applicants for the Waste  
20 Tire Track and Other Recreational Surfacing Grant Program  
21 in order of ranking until allocated funds are exhausted.

22 In addition, staff is requesting approval for the  
23 rank of the remaining applicants to be used for future  
24 consideration from reallocation monies, for a total of  
25 \$948,545. If the Board approves these funding

1 recommendations 21 projects would be funded, for a total  
2 of \$1,948,545.

3 Grant applications were score based on the  
4 criteria and evaluation process approved by the Board at  
5 its July 2002 Board meeting. Staff mailed the notice of  
6 funds available to more than 4,000 potential applicants in  
7 northern and southern California in August of 2002.

8 Geographic distribution of funds. Of the 31  
9 eligible applications scored, 21 applications achieved a  
10 passing score, 15 applications from northern California  
11 and 6 applications from southern California.

12 Of the \$1 million in total funding \$487,160 is  
13 recommended for 5 northern California projects; and  
14 \$512,840 is recommended for 6 southern California  
15 projects.

16 Of the 31 scored applications the scores range  
17 from 52 to 91 points, and the average score was 73 out of  
18 100 possible points.

19 During Special Waste and Waste Prevention  
20 Committee meeting held on July 8th, 2000, Board member  
21 Jones expressed interest in collecting or defining the  
22 amount of non-California rubber used for the project. In  
23 the application staff collected data information from 31  
24 applicants.

25 The survey questions included: "Other than the



1 grant and match funds expended for this project, are you  
2 using products made from waste tire rubber on any other  
3 projects?" Twenty-one applicants stated no, ten  
4 applicants stated yes.

5 "If yes, what are the sources of the waste tire  
6 rubber?" All ten applicants used California waste tires.

7 Economic need. Of the 31 applications scored, 3  
8 applicants qualified to receive points for the  
9 economic-need criterion. All 3 applicants are from  
10 northern California and received a passing score. Two of  
11 the applicants are in the reallocation item. The number  
12 of points they received depended on the state median  
13 household income of the project zip code area.

14 All 3 applicants received 5 points and qualified  
15 for the extreme financial hardship. This allowed the  
16 applicant to reduce match amount to 50 percent of the  
17 grant amount request.

18 Staff will be presenting the criteria for the  
19 third cycle of Waste Tire Track and Other Recreational  
20 Surfacing Grant Program in July 2003.

21 Staff recommends that the Board approve  
22 Resolution Number 2003-146 and award a total \$1 million to  
23 the 11 projects listed in the resolution.

24 That completes my presentation.

25 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Thank you, Ms. Yates.

1 Board members, any questions? Board Member  
2 Paparian, Board Member Jones?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.  
4 Chairman.

5 As I understand this, we're approving the million  
6 dollars for the first 11 projects. And if for some reason  
7 one of those projects comes in at a lower cost or doesn't  
8 get funded, then we start moving down from the top of the  
9 next list until we hit a million dollars. And then  
10 whatever's left over in that second list, we would have  
11 available if we wanted to do this in a reallocation item,  
12 in May, I presume.

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: That is correct, Mr.  
14 Paparian.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Okay. And Mr. Lee  
16 and I had a conversation about this concept. And what I  
17 indicated was that I'm not sure, you know, just speaking  
18 for myself, how I feel about as a general rule putting  
19 additional allocations kind of on auto-pilot for  
20 allocation if funds aren't available for the first chunk.

21 In this case I'm comfortable with it. But just  
22 to alert you, I don't view this as the precedent that  
23 means in all cases we should put this type of situation on  
24 auto-pilot where we jump to the second list and  
25 automatically start funding.

1           DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: I understand your position.  
2 And, again -- and we just wanted it to be said in the  
3 resolution we wanted to just to highlight. And I'm glad  
4 that you noted that revision in the resolution. And I  
5 understand, you know, your comments on that portion of it.

6           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

7           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chair, I'd like  
8 to move adoption of Resolution 2003-146, consideration of  
9 the grant awards for the Waste Tire Track and Other  
10 Recreational Surfacing Grant program for Fiscal Year  
11 2002-2003.

12          COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.

13          CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-146 has been  
14 moved and seconded.

15          Call the roll please.

16          SECRETARY HARRIS: Jones?

17          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.

18          SECRETARY HARRIS: Paparian?

19          COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.

20          SECRETARY HARRIS: Washington?

21          COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Aye.

22          SECRETARY HARRIS: Medina?

23          CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Aye.

24          This item will be placed on the consent calendar.

25          DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Committee item C is

1 consideration of proposed applicant eligibility, project  
2 eligibility, scoring criteria, and evaluation process for  
3 the Local Government Public Education and Amnesty Day  
4 Grant Program, Fiscal Year 2003-2004.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Before we proceed, the last  
6 item will go on fiscal consent.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Boxing Cheng will present  
8 this item.

9 MR. CHENG: Committee Chair and Board Members.  
10 This is Boxing Cheng. I'm here to present this item for  
11 Board consideration of the proposed applicant eligibility,  
12 project eligibility, scoring criteria, and evaluation  
13 process for the Local Government Public Education and  
14 Amnesty Grant, Fiscal Year 2003-2004.

15 Since 1992 the Board has provided more than 1.7  
16 million in grants found to support the local government  
17 over 100 grants. The purpose of the amnesty grants,  
18 there's two. One is an educational program to inform the  
19 public about proper tire disposal and the proper tire  
20 care. Two is fund amnesty events to allow the public and  
21 the local government to management nuisance tires and the  
22 small tire piles.

23 The funding comes from Senate Bill 876. In the  
24 five-year plan the Board allocated \$500,000 for this  
25 program for the Fiscal Year 2003-2004 grant cycle.

1 Eligible applicants are California cities,  
2 counties, special districts or public subdivisions and  
3 qualified California indian grants. For the project  
4 eligibility staff proposed that each grant program consist  
5 of two parts: One, address the proposed for cleaning up  
6 nuisance tire and small tire piles in the jurisdiction.  
7 Two is the educational program.

8 There's big change in this grant. For the first  
9 two grant cycles, Fiscal Year '98-'99, Fiscal Year  
10 '99-2000, the Board required that 100 percent were  
11 matching. But for the third and the fourth cycle, for  
12 Year 2001-2002, 2002-2003, that will be reduced to 50  
13 percent match. In order to increase the number of  
14 applicants and the amounts of funds request, staff  
15 proposes reducing the matching from 50 percent to zero.  
16 In this way, rural area that has lack of funds to solve  
17 the problems will be better served.

18 Proposed maximum amount is 20,000 per award.  
19 Except when up to three jurisdictions join together using  
20 a formal agreement to apply the joint powers grants, that  
21 amount can be 50 thousand. The Board approved this  
22 procedure in the previous grant cycle.

23 For the proposed scoring criteria, the Board  
24 approved a 6 general criteria in 1996. In November 2001,  
25 Board formally adopted the 7th general criteria. In June

1 2002, Board ratified the current policy on grants scoring  
2 criteria and the evaluation process. Staff modified the  
3 general criteria, the contents.

4 But also there's three changes on the general  
5 criteria. Staff changed the general criteria number 2 to  
6 goals and objectives, and also decrease the points --  
7 possible points from 10 to 5 points.

8 For general criteria number 3, was renamed to  
9 "workplan" instead of "methodology."

10 The staff also increased the points budget to 10  
11 points from 5 points.

12 The program criteria number 8 to 12 for this  
13 cycle has not been changed from last cycle.

14 The general review criteria total 65 points. And  
15 the program criteria total is 35 points. And total is 100  
16 points.

17 The 70 points will be possible grant points.

18 For the evaluation and the procedure, this cycle  
19 had not been changed from the last cycle.

20 Staff recommends that the Board adopt Resolution  
21 Number 2003-144 and direct to staff to use these applicant  
22 eligibility, project eligibility, scoring criteria, and  
23 evaluation process for this grants applications.

24 This ends my presentation. Staff is ready --

25 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Thank you, Mr. Cheng.

1 Board members, any questions?

2 Board member Paparian.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Chairman.

5 Two things. We just found out about a situation  
6 that happened over the weekend. And it's somewhat  
7 unrelated to the grant program itself. But the City of  
8 Madera apparently held an Amnesty Day last weekend. And  
9 they expected to get about 10,000 tires, and they wound up  
10 getting 50,000 tires. I think they're working with Golden  
11 By-products. I think they're working with Golden  
12 By-products to try to figure out how to deal with those  
13 50,000 tires. It's a good thing that those 50,000 tires  
14 are out of the disposals -- you know, out of the illegal  
15 disposal streams or whatever. But it really shook up the  
16 City of Madera. And apparently we don't have any funds  
17 that they can tap into since they had tried to get a grant  
18 previously and didn't manage to get the grant.

19 So the couple of things that arise from that, one  
20 would be, do we have any general guidance we give to  
21 localities about how to structure -- there was one thing I  
22 heard about in the structure of their Amnesty Day that,  
23 you know, struck me as perhaps peculiar, which is they  
24 didn't put a limit on the number of tires that someone  
25 could bring in, and they had a couple semi loads come in.

1 (Laughter.)

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Do we have any just  
3 general guidance we give to localities on how to structure  
4 an Amnesty Day so it works and they don't get, you know,  
5 caught?

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Well, let me just answer  
7 that.

8 Mr. Paparian, I think the -- we've looked at this  
9 issue a little bit. And apparently the City of Madera,  
10 you know, held this event. It wasn't in conjunction with  
11 any, you know, Board sponsorship. And like I say, while I  
12 think we certainly, you know, like the fact that they were  
13 taking the initiative being proactive on this front, it  
14 does present a difficult situation for us in, you know,  
15 trying to provide any help to them retroactively. And  
16 that there is a -- there isn't any kind of rainy-day fund,  
17 you know, that I know of, that the Board could utilize to  
18 assist if that was the Board's intent. You know, there is  
19 an emergency reserve. But, again, that's supposed to, as  
20 I understand, to be used just for situations like tire  
21 fires where there's an immediate threat to public health  
22 and safety or the environment.

23 So I think this is an unfortunate circumstance,  
24 but I'm not aware of any financial help that we could  
25 provide retroactively, you know, to the City of Madera for



1 this situation.

2 With regards to advice that we provide to general  
3 people that do have Amnesty Day grants from the Board,  
4 that I think I'd like to ask Linda Dickinson or Martha  
5 Gildart to respond to that.

6 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Any of these tires originate  
7 from any farm or ranch or reservation?

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. DICKINSON: Linda Dickinson with the Waste  
10 Tire and Diversion Section, Acting Supervisor.

11 We can include in the application direction on  
12 the best way to hold their Amnesty Day event. And we can  
13 also include a sample application on-line that they can  
14 access and maybe be able to do their application a little  
15 easier. And Madera will be able to apply for this one for  
16 future Amnesty Day events.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: One of the things I  
18 was trying to get to is, in some other areas the Waste  
19 Board provides kind of best-practices guidance, you know,  
20 a page or two of, you know, if you're going to do an  
21 Amnesty Day, here are some tips that you might want to  
22 consider, one of which of course being put a limit on the  
23 number of tires that can come in in a single load.  
24 There's probably a bunch of others involving, you know,  
25 safety of the workers and the location and disposition of

1 tires and so forth.

2           So I'm just asking you consider pulling something  
3 like that together. And I think sometimes we learn from  
4 experiences like Madera. And I think that perhaps is one  
5 of the things that we might --

6           MR. DICKINSON: Well, I think their need might be  
7 a little better on their application this time. They'll  
8 be able to prove it.

9           COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Yes.

10          I had one other thing, but did you want to --

11          COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Well, I just wanted  
12 to -- on that particular issue, I just want to make sure  
13 that we don't start opening Pandora's Box. I mean it's an  
14 unfortunate situation. But you don't want to go down the  
15 street of trying to help out one, because when one finds  
16 out that you can do it, then others come on board and they  
17 start doing their own programs and they pop up everywhere.  
18 And then people would be inundating the Board trying to  
19 get resources for it.

20          So I hope that while you're doing it that you  
21 look at a way that it won't put a burden on the Board. We  
22 have a program in place and, unfortunately, people have to  
23 follow that criteria. And when they do it on their own,  
24 they're kind of held responsible for taking care of that  
25 stuff themselves.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Yeah, I thought about  
2 suggesting such a fund, and then I didn't. What I am  
3 suggesting is just a sort of guidance document; that  
4 whether someone has an Amnesty Day grant or not, you know,  
5 just a little basic advice based on our best experiences  
6 around the state.

7 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: I think Board Member  
8 Jones has the floor now.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'm sorry. I had one  
10 other thing, but --

11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just a quick question for  
12 Martha and Linda. I know we had this issue, either at one  
13 of our tire conferences or something, where we were  
14 telling folks things like limit the amount of tires to X  
15 amount of tires. Because legally they're only supposed to  
16 be able to haul five or eight, ten. So legally ten is all  
17 they can haul without a manifest unless they get -- or  
18 nine --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Don't look like no  
20 five or ten on these pictures.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: No, I understand. But  
22 the law -- our law says without a one-day variance, or  
23 something like that, they're only supposed to be able to  
24 haul nine. We had talked about -- we had given direction  
25 to cities that they could do pre-subscriptions, where

1 people interested in bringing tires would be given a  
2 voucher, just a little slip that says, "We're going to  
3 have this many," three loads, two loads, whatever.  
4 Because this has happened in other places.

5 Stockton was a perfect example where truckloads  
6 of tires were coming in when Stockton did its first  
7 cleanup event at the coal co-gen plant.

8 And my question to you, Martha, is -- we either  
9 did this in a workshop or we did it as part of the  
10 ten-year -- or the five-year tire plan development  
11 originally or somewhere where we were coming up with some  
12 guidance to give the local governments. Did we ever --  
13 didn't we --

14 SUPERVISING WASTE MANAGEMENT ENGINEER GILDART:  
15 Martha Gildart.

16 Yes, we have given advice such as limiting the  
17 number of tires per person, which is partially already  
18 limited by the legal limit. If they're individuals who  
19 were requesting the exemption for the one day haul, that  
20 was where we said you might want to consider putting a  
21 limit on the number of tires even under that exemption.

22 The problem with this is it was not a grantee of  
23 the Board. We did not have the ability to tell them, you  
24 know, or maybe share with them the advice that we've  
25 learned from other collection events. So maybe we could

1 have more information available in our web on how to  
2 conduct -- that anyone could access, not just what we  
3 share with a grantee. I think that's where the slip-up  
4 occurred.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board member Paparian.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Yeah, thank you.

7 That's great. That's exactly what I was suggesting.

8 On this item itself, we're going from a matching  
9 grant program to a non-matching grant program. We're  
10 going to 100 percent for this cycle.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: That is correct.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: And I tend to like  
13 some participation from local governments on programs like  
14 this. I'm okay with trying it out this time, but would  
15 like before we go into the next cycle, which would be  
16 '04,-'05, for staff to report back to the Board on the  
17 experiences of one versus the other, and, you know, tell  
18 us about the pros and cons so that we can discuss that and  
19 decide whether we would want to continue it as a 100  
20 percent grant or as a matching grant.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: I understand your comment,  
22 Mr. Paparian, and I think it's a good idea. Like I said,  
23 I had some reservations myself again about whether or not  
24 the reduce the match to zero is going to accomplish all of  
25 our objectives. Again, the data -- when we go back and

1 look at the past cycles, you know, the data is kind of --  
2 you know, it's kind of an equivocal situation where you  
3 can interpreted it differently as to the effectiveness of  
4 the match and soliciting the demand.

5           So I think -- I think is something that, you  
6 know, I was thinking about anyway with regards to making  
7 sure that the matching grant is the appropriate variable  
8 that we need to be looking at in order to increase the  
9 participation in the program, which is our main objective.

10           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

11           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Mr. Lee, so this  
12 was a matching program and then it went to 100 funding  
13 program?

14           DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: That is correct. We've  
15 been steadily reducing the match over the years in an  
16 attempt to solicit, you know, more participation from the  
17 smaller jurisdictions, the rural jurisdictions.

18           SUPERVISING WASTE MANAGEMENT ENGINEER GILDART:

19           Over the years as we've held the program, we've  
20 had very high participation in early years from  
21 communities who had some funds available. They would meet  
22 our match requirement. They conducted the program. It  
23 was a very popular thing. This idea of more tires than  
24 expected has happened a couple times. Maybe not quite  
25 this extreme as the Madera one.

1           However, some of the underserved low-income  
2 counties within the state started saying that they had no  
3 funds available and have not conducted the program.

4           So we've sort of ratcheted it down. You know, as  
5 the Board's fee increased and our fund increased, we  
6 thought, "Well, let's see how many more participants we  
7 get at this rate."

8           Now, as you saw on the grant that was offered  
9 just previously, the track grant, we have extra points for  
10 those who are in lower income areas. That might be an  
11 alternative. We could consider if this version, let's  
12 say, is either oversubscribed or it's still  
13 undersubscribed, maybe we could go to a point-based system  
14 based on your, you know, zip code and income level or  
15 something.

16           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: What'd she say?

17           SUPERVISING WASTE MANAGEMENT ENGINEER GILDART:

18           She was giving the official term, "zip code area"  
19 according to U.S. --

20           MR. DICKINSON: It's a new term. It's zip code  
21 area --

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I don't have  
23 any problem with that.

24           MR. DICKINSON: -- It's the zip code tabulation  
25 area.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: No, I appreciate  
2 that. I just wanted to know why it was...

3 Mr. Chair, I'd like to move adoption of  
4 Resolution 2003-144, consideration of proposed applicant  
5 eligibility, project eligibility, scoring criteria, and  
6 evaluation process for the Local Government Public  
7 Education and Amnesty Day Grant Program, Fiscal Year  
8 2003-2004.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second.

10 But I'd like to ask a question, Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Certainly.

12 Mr. Jones.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Thanks.

14 I know there's a five-point deduction if you've  
15 gotten any grants from the Board previous three years. If  
16 you've gotten a tire amnesty grant, in the last three  
17 years, we're not recognizing that. What I'd hate to see  
18 is the ones that have been getting -- have gotten tire  
19 amnesty grants in the last three years, there should be  
20 some deduction more than five points so that some of these  
21 new areas that underserved could take advantage of it.  
22 I'd hate to see a good proposal come in from a well-healed  
23 community and get it because they only lost five points.

24 Maybe we can't deal with it. But, you know, if  
25 we're really going after folks that can't afford it, we



1 ought to have a deduction for people that have taken  
2 advantage of it more than five points.

3 MR. DICKINSON: It's not currently part of that  
4 criteria right now to have a five point-reduction if  
5 you've had previous grants. Did you want it to be part of  
6 it?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I want to ask the  
8 members -- I want to see if I can amend the resolution, if  
9 they'll go for it.

10 Under "need" which is 20 points, the 31st  
11 category. Could we add that if you received an  
12 amnesty grant -- tire amnesty grant in the last two years,  
13 that that would be an automatic minus ten.

14 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Paparian.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: I was just signaling  
16 that that was -- I like that idea.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Washington.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I guess I'm trying  
19 to understand. So we're penalizing those who've received  
20 the grant?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Those that have received  
22 the grant in the last couple of years, because they could  
23 do matches and stuff. Usually -- all I'm saying is  
24 they've gotten -- they've come to the trough twice. The  
25 minus ten would still give them -- could still give them

1 90 points, but it may be the difference between somebody's  
2 that's never gotten a grant and somebody that's gotten a  
3 grant in the past. That's all I'm trying to do. Not  
4 penalize them. Just give those that have never been able  
5 to do it because they haven't had the money for the  
6 match -- that they not lose to a county that's got this  
7 down to a science on how to get our grant money.

8 That ten points might be the difference.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I don't know,  
10 because if I had it down to a science, I'd be mad at you,  
11 Mr. Jones, if you penalize me --

12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Well, I got people mad at me  
13 all the time.

14 (Laughter.)

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I amend my motion  
16 to include that recommendation of Mr. Jones.

17 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Very good.

18 MR. DICKINSON: Clarification. Sorry.

19 Do you want us to add that to program criteria?  
20 And then it would change the points.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: No, I want it as a  
22 caveat under "need" that if you've received this  
23 amnesty -- this grant in the last two cycles, two years,  
24 there would be a minus ten points.

25 MR. DICKINSON: So part of the 20 points, if they

1 received it, they only can get a total of 10.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Of 10.

3 MR. DICKINSON: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Is that right, Mr.

5 Medina? Is that fine?

6 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yeah, okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yes.

10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: Could you give us a  
11 pause here for a second. I think there's been generally a  
12 reluctance -- and I can't cite chapter and verse, but  
13 there's been a reluctance to amend general criteria. But  
14 typically we have only amended program criteria. And  
15 general criteria get amended as part of a larger grant  
16 discussion, not specific to any one allocation or another.

17 So -- and, again, I can't cite chapter and verse,  
18 but I know that's been typical Board policy.

19 So it might be cleaner in the interests of  
20 meeting the suggestion is to do -- as part of our program  
21 criteria and add a separate program criteria number of  
22 maybe even a 13 that says maybe -- to the effect that it  
23 would be cleaner to add 10 points for those jurisdictions  
24 who have not previously received a grant over the last two  
25 years, rather than a 10-point penalty.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: That's fine.

2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: Martha.

3 SUPERVISING WASTE MANAGEMENT ENGINEER GILDART:

4 In the past when we've done that kind of a  
5 criteria, yes, we've had a 5 points available to  
6 first-time applicants or something as part of the program  
7 criteria.

8 It does seem to me though that if we're doing  
9 this in the negative, we might be able to just subtract it  
10 off the total. It wouldn't really be part of either the  
11 general criteria or the program criteria. It's a  
12 negative. Anybody who, let's say, has applied in the past  
13 receives a final score, and at the end we just subtract  
14 10? Is that what you're saying? I think we could do that  
15 under the program criteria and not worry about percentages  
16 because it would just take it off.

17 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: Mr. Chairman.

18 SUPERVISING WASTE MANAGEMENT ENGINEER GILDART:

19 But it would have to be in the program criteria, not in  
20 the general criteria, which is typically part of -- and I  
21 can see some confusion on a couple of the newer members'  
22 faces. But this Board has considered general criteria  
23 that they want to apply to all grant programs, no matter  
24 what type. And they usually consider it in toto. They  
25 look at all those general criteria and evaluate what the

1 implications would be against all the grant programs.

2           So what we could do -- but the program criteria  
3 just come with those specific changes in the program item.

4           EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: I was simply going to  
5 suggest that we wrestle with this over the break. Can we  
6 just postpone action on this item? Staff will wrestle  
7 with this at the break, come back with a recommendation  
8 right after the break. And we can at this point move on  
9 to the next item.

10           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Let me ask the maker --

11           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chair.

12           Don't understand why you're wrestling over this.  
13 I'm more inclined to support a negative than I am a  
14 positive. And let me tell you why. It makes no sense for  
15 someone who just applies for something, they throw their  
16 application in, and you automatically give them 5 points  
17 or 10 points. I'm not supportive of that. I think that  
18 if people have a record -- and that's what we base life  
19 on, people's experiences and their records -- I think it's  
20 much easier to say, "Because you've applied and you've won  
21 this contract" or "you've gotten this money a couple  
22 times," it's easier to say, "we want to give other people  
23 an opportunity, so we'll just reduce your number." But  
24 just to automatically give somebody 5 points because they  
25 apply is kind of strange to me. So just something to

1 wrestle with there.

2 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Let me ask the maker of the  
3 motion and the maker of the amendment, would you rather  
4 vote on this now, Board member, or --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I think we can wrestle  
6 with --

7 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: We will take this up after  
8 the break then and -- which we're not taking now.

9 So we'll move on to the next item.

10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: Thank you.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chair Medina.

12 Committee Item D is consideration of the grant  
13 awards for the Waste Tire Enforcement Grant Program for  
14 Fiscal Year 2002-2003.

15 Don Dier will make this presentation.

16 MR. DIER: Chairman, with me is Dave Volden,  
17 Program staff, who has done the bulk of the work on this  
18 item that I'll be presenting.

19 This item concerns the award of the Fiscal Year  
20 2002-3 Waste Tire Enforcement Grants.

21 Looking back at the March 2001 meeting when the  
22 Board adopted the five-year tire plan, the Board had  
23 allocated monies each year for this program. The first  
24 year of the plan there was \$2 million allocated. This  
25 year there was \$4 million. And then next year is \$6

1 million allocated -- next year and for each year  
2 thereafter.

3           In my mind when I came to the program, little  
4 less than a year ago, this represented to me a significant  
5 commitment from the Board to enhancing local enforcement,  
6 given that our resources -- we've only got four field  
7 staff throughout the entire state to do enforcement.

8           So in my mind what the Board was signaling was a  
9 shift to a lot of the activity, and in particular in this  
10 program for surveillance and inspection services would be  
11 shifted to the locals and overseen by our field staff.

12           That was my impression and it's my understanding  
13 that was the intent of the Board in allocating the funds  
14 in the five-year plan that way.

15           Historically though this program has been  
16 undersubscribed. As I said last year, there was \$2  
17 million allocated and there was less than \$900,000  
18 actually applied for and given out in the grants with  
19 eight jurisdictions.

20           So to address that, we asked folks, "Well, what's  
21 your concern? Why aren't you applying?" And we got  
22 several reasons. And so we brought an item to the board  
23 last August to revise the program.

24           And the Board did approve those changes, to make  
25 it noncompetitive from competitive -- that was a big issue

1 with the locals -- and also to shift it to a 12-month  
2 cycle so that we're on an annual 12-month funding basis,  
3 which fits in with budgeting because what these funds are  
4 doing is providing staff services. So they -- the locals  
5 have difficulty in staffing with uncertainty with regards  
6 to the funds. So the continued funding provides us -- we  
7 can't commit and say definitely that it will be funded in  
8 the future. But I think by the direction of the five-year  
9 plan and the actions of the Board last August, that the  
10 locals are much more confident about participating in this  
11 program.

12 In fact they're so confident that our -- you  
13 know, it's increased threefold. We now have -- went from  
14 8 to 25 jurisdictions that applied for these grants.

15 The maximum amount was increased to \$300,000 per  
16 grant. And the eligible applicants include cities and  
17 county agencies with experience in enforcement of laws and  
18 regulations and protection of the public health, safety,  
19 and the environment.

20 The funding pays for personnel we're asking for.  
21 And they're expecting people to be dedicated to providing  
22 the inspection and surveillance services for the Waste  
23 Tire Program. And also equipment, which can include  
24 surveillance equipment, computers, and any other equipment  
25 needed at the local level to carry out those functions.



1           The duties of the grantees include identifying  
2 the legal waste tire piles, investigating and inspecting  
3 waste tire facilities and points of tire generation, and  
4 examining waste tire hauler registration manifest  
5 documents. As you know, the new waste tire manifest  
6 system is going to be rolled out this July 1. So we see  
7 these local agencies being a key component of the success  
8 of that program, to be able to do the inspections at the  
9 tire generator hauler and end-user points and check to  
10 make sure that all the records are being maintained  
11 properly.

12           Grantees will also have the ability -- and I want  
13 to make this point, that by approving these grants we are  
14 not delegating enforcement responsibilities. What we are  
15 doing in essence is contracting for inspection services.  
16 That's how I like to view these. It's a contracted  
17 service for inspection and surveillance.

18           As a part of that responsibility though under the  
19 grant, the grantees will also be able to issue letters of  
20 violation when they find violations of waste tire  
21 standards.

22           This is viewed by some as like a first level  
23 enforcement action. However, we don't consider it a  
24 formal enforcement action, a warning letter -- it's  
25 essentially a warning letter. What we are doing is

1 retaining enforcement responsibility at the Board level.  
2 So although we encourage to seek compliance at the lowest  
3 level possible, which would be either at the inspection  
4 itself or after a letter of violation is issued, if  
5 compliance isn't attained, then we would have that  
6 matter -- that case be referred up to the Board for the  
7 additional enforcement actions through the process that we  
8 have established.

9 We distributed the notice of funds available for  
10 this program to approximately 350 interested parties. It  
11 was also made available on the Board's website. The  
12 application period was from October through December 13th.

13 As I indicated, we received 25 applications,  
14 which is a threefold increase from last year. In fact the  
15 total was over 3 -- almost \$4.4 million was requested.  
16 And the Board had allocated \$4 million. To they've had a  
17 task to try and get that under \$4 million.

18 Now, understand that there's not -- they're not  
19 prescribed formulas on these applications. These are --  
20 the applications are unique and individual to each  
21 jurisdiction. So the costs have a very wide range,  
22 depending on the city or county in which they're in, the  
23 hourly costs for labor and that sort of thing.

24 But we were successful -- all of the applicants  
25 were very agreeable to working with us in cutting some of

1 the costs. And we were able to get that reduced down to  
2 under the \$4 million amount.

3 We did have a review panel of three staff,  
4 including representatives from the Legal Office to review  
5 the information and determine the eligibility of all these  
6 applications. And based on the panel's review we were  
7 successful in getting reductions to bring it under the \$4  
8 million.

9 We notified everyone, and they were pleased with  
10 the outcome of the process.

11 We've included the results of the award or the  
12 proposed award and the funding recommendations in  
13 Attachment 1 to the agenda item. The amount recommended  
14 for funding is \$3,877,304.

15 Additionally -- and I'd like to get back to the  
16 point about the reliance that we're going to have in the  
17 future for locals. Because we're anticipating under the  
18 five-year plan an additional \$2 million available next  
19 year, we have identified 18 additional counties that we  
20 would like to bring into this program next year in the  
21 next cycle. We feel that it's imperative for the success  
22 of the Permitting and Enforcement and Manifest Program to  
23 have as much coverage as possible in the areas where  
24 there's most tire generation and transport. So we're  
25 looking forward to pursuing that.

1 I would like to compliment Dave Volden because  
2 when we made the shift last August with the Board changing  
3 the criteria and the construction of this program, I  
4 challenged Dave to go out with a very aggressive marketing  
5 campaign. And so Dave was on the road for a number of  
6 months talking to cities and counties and anybody that  
7 would open the door for him. And I'd just like to  
8 compliment him. He's been very successful in getting this  
9 program market. We've addressed the concerns of the  
10 locals, why they weren't participating. And now the  
11 results are they are participating.

12 So after approval -- assuming approval by the  
13 Committee and Board this month, we will then enter into  
14 the grant agreements. They'll be written up and presented  
15 to executive staff.

16 I would like to point -- also add one thing. It  
17 dawned on me -- this is a little short notice. It dawned  
18 on me sitting in P&E Committee yesterday when the LEA  
19 grant program was before P&E Committee asking for an  
20 exemption from the permit check list that we had failed to  
21 seek that from the Board for this item. I mean in our  
22 minds we said, well, intuitively it doesn't apply. We're  
23 just, you know, getting some inspection services. But I  
24 thought it would be prudent to bring it up to the  
25 Committee. And it's our recommendation that an exemption

1 be granted for the permit check list for this grant  
2 program. And if the Committee agrees, I would like to add  
3 some language to the resolution. And I'll have it  
4 ready -- If I understand, this item will be at Admin  
5 Committee tomorrow. So I would bring that revised  
6 resolution to Admin Committee and the Board next week for  
7 consideration if the Committee would agree with that.

8 That being the case, staff recommends approval of  
9 the grant awards and adoption of Resolution 2003-149.

10 And we're ready for any questions.

11 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Just briefly.

13 Don, in terms of going from a competitive  
14 process, if you go back -- if you go from a competitive  
15 process and people go out and you get all these folks who  
16 apply for this money, how would you process the criteria  
17 for next year if it's not a competitive process next year?

18 MR. DIER: Well, it wasn't competitive this year.  
19 What we did was we -- was last year's was competitive and  
20 years before that.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: You didn't get  
22 folks who applied for it?

23 MR. DIER: That was one of the concerns expressed  
24 to us as to why there was not better participation. So we  
25 asked the Board --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah. And I don't  
2 mean to cut you off, but that's my point. So if next year  
3 you get a huge amount of folks who apply for it and it  
4 exceeds the amount of money, then how would you break it  
5 down? And I'm -- just a question.

6 MR. DIER: And typically -- we were concerned  
7 about that, and that was a part of the item that we  
8 brought last August to the Board when we laid out how we  
9 would deal with if we got oversubscribed. We had some  
10 criteria on how we would address reducing those down to  
11 the allocated amount.

12 Part of that also had to do with our marketing  
13 effort, because we -- you know, we know the jurisdictions  
14 that we would like to get into the program. And so we're  
15 really targeting them and working with them. Knowing how  
16 much money we'd have available, then we can talk to them  
17 about what level of involvement they can have.

18 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board member Paparian.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Some of the costs  
20 here -- obviously staffing would be an ongoing cost. But  
21 some of the costs appear to be one-time or fairly  
22 short-term costs, some of the equipment costs. Probably  
23 some of the initial work in identifying illegal tire piles  
24 obviously will probably still continue forever, we have so  
25 many illegal tire piles. But when you first -- you know,

1 when you first start looking around a community, you're  
2 probably more likely to find more and have more of a need  
3 there.

4 So are you anticipating that the amounts are  
5 going to go down from some of the existing jurisdictions  
6 in terms of their requests?

7 MR. DIER: Yes, we would. We would expect -- for  
8 two reasons: One, as you mention, the equipment. Some of  
9 the hard equipment could be a first-year one-time cost.

10 We also -- one of the first tasks under the grant  
11 is to establish a database, an inventory, of facilities  
12 and the higher generation points within the jurisdiction.

13 That we see as a peak effort in the first year or  
14 maybe the first six months. And that would trail off.  
15 But there's a maintenance level that would continue. But  
16 we would expect that, you know, that there's a peak in the  
17 first year. We don't know exactly what that is -- I mean  
18 each jurisdiction. But, yes, we're anticipating that the  
19 amounts will be reducing slightly to make room for --  
20 and -- well, actually we're bank on that -- to make room  
21 for additional jurisdictions that we want to bring into  
22 the program next year.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: And then somehow --  
24 Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this would be appropriate  
25 for Committee meeting or if you'd rather I just do it on

1 my own. But I'd like to kind of get a sense of how all  
2 our enforcement stuff fits together. We have this. We  
3 have the CDAA program. We have our staff doing stuff. We  
4 have the Legal Office doing stuff. We have the Attorney  
5 General's Office doing stuff.

6 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: I don't think this is the  
7 appropriate time for that, Board Member Paparian.  
8 However, we can make time available somewhere along the  
9 road in order to address that very concern.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: It's much so much a  
11 concern. It's more an educational thing. I'd like to  
12 kind of have a good sense of how it all fits together.  
13 And, again, if -- I guess what I'm asking is whether you  
14 would prefer for me just to do that on my own, or whether  
15 you would like that to be an agenda item for the whole  
16 Committee.

17 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Well, I think we can decide  
18 that. We have ample time to decide that -- Committee  
19 agenda. Certainly we can all look into that.

20 I had one question, and that's in regard to these  
21 grants. I didn't see any tribal governments that are  
22 listed here. As I understand it, they are eligible under  
23 local enforcement agency. Do you know if any outreach was  
24 done to any tribal governments?

25 MR. VOLDEN: Dave Volden, for the record.



1           In this initial round of the noncompetitive  
2 process we did not do any outreach to the tribal  
3 governments. But that's something that we will definitely  
4 consider in the next round.

5           At this point I didn't know that they were  
6 eligible for or had their enforcement agencies.

7           The criteria approved by the Board were for city  
8 and county enforcement agencies.

9           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: According to what it states  
10 here in the statements, it says, "Grants are available to  
11 local enforcement agencies, California cities, counties,  
12 special districts, joint powers, agencies or political  
13 subdivisions."

14           And let me ask legal counsel this. Tribal  
15 governments, are they eligible under the local enforcement  
16 agency?

17           CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: You know, I don't think  
18 they are. But I think that that study that we're  
19 currently having done by UCLA will answer a lot of these  
20 questions.

21           What we've done in some of the statutes is gone  
22 back and had the tribes amended in. So I'd have to look  
23 at this particular one to see how it fits.

24           As to whether they could receive a grant, I don't  
25 think we have a problem cleaning it up on the tribal

1 properties. But I'll have to check and see about the  
2 actually receiving a grant. But I think that if it's not  
3 clear from the statute I think the study will show us how  
4 to do that and whether we need to amend the statute or  
5 whether we could do it ourselves. But I think that  
6 information is coming this spring.

7 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Okay. Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Jones.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: All right. Thank you.

11 I want to congratulate Mr. Dier and Dave and the  
12 staff for getting this put together. When Dorothy Rice  
13 was the Deputy Director for P&E -- I think we're going  
14 back to '97 or '98 -- with limited money we were trying to  
15 figure out how to get locals involved in. -- because we  
16 only had Keith Cambridge and one other person I think that  
17 were actually trying to enforce a whole state full of  
18 haulers and piles. And we knew that the key was local  
19 government, getting them involved. And I know we had Yuba  
20 City and we had a -- just a few -- I think we only had  
21 three or four and we had to basically beg them to do the  
22 work.

23 And it was a key part of SB 876, was for us to  
24 get local governments involved in this. So it's not going  
25 just be tire piles. It's going to be check and manifest,

1 checking to see who's getting it illegally, those types of  
2 things. This is a huge step for the tire program.

3 I do think that we need to -- I have no problem  
4 with the grant exclusion. But I think, really, we should  
5 have that information at the Board meeting when we go  
6 through this, just so all the members are comfortable with  
7 that. I personally think it falls into exactly what the  
8 LEA grants are. But I don't know that off the top of  
9 my -- I mean I don't think that's fair to the members to  
10 make that decision without a little bit of help.

11 MR. DIER: From my perspective they're the  
12 same -- they're the same in the sense that they're  
13 noncompetitive. However, these are not entitlement  
14 grants -- the LEA grants are not entitlement grants.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, that's what sort  
16 of struck me that we probably need just a little bit of  
17 work on this.

18 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: We have a mover on this  
19 resolution?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Sorry, Mr. Chair.

21 I'll move adoption of Resolution 2003-149,  
22 consideration of the grant awards for the Waste Tire  
23 Enforcement Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2-3.

24 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Is there a second?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Okay. Resolution 2003-149  
2 has been moved by Board Member Jones, seconded by Board  
3 Member Washington.

4 Call the roll please.

5 SECRETARY HARRIS: Jones?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.

7 SECRETARY HARRIS: Paparian?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Just to be clear.

9 Don, as you're fixing the resolution for  
10 tomorrow, the last "resolved" clause is in the wrong  
11 place, if you look at the resolution. We have a resolved  
12 that leads -- well, you'll see it. It'll be obvious.

13 So I vote aye.

14 SECRETARY HARRIS: Washington?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Aye.

16 SECRETARY HARRIS: Medina?

17 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Aye.

18 This item will be placed on the consent calendar.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Can we hold this  
20 off the consent, Mr. Chair, so we can address those issues  
21 that was brought up about the tribes? Let's keep it off  
22 consent.

23 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: We will do that.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Sorry. What was the motion  
25 by Mr. Washington? Your mike wasn't on.

1 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: This will not be placed on  
2 consent.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Committee Item E is  
4 consideration of the scoring criteria and evaluation  
5 process for the Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Household Hazardous  
6 Waste grants.

7 Glenn Gallagher will make the presentation.

8 MR. GALLAGHER: Good morning, Chairman Medina and  
9 Board members. My name is Glenn Gallagher, the Grant  
10 Manager in the Used Oil and Household Hazardous Waste  
11 Branch.

12 Can I get the slides on please?

13 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
14 Presented as follows.)

15 MR. GALLAGHER: I will present Item E,  
16 consideration of the scoring criteria and evaluation  
17 process for the Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Household Hazardous  
18 Waste Grant Program.

19 Board staff proposes 4,500,000 from the  
20 Integrated Waste Management Account for these grants.

21 Public Resource Code Section 47200 states that up  
22 to \$5 million can be allocated for the Household Hazardous  
23 Waste Grant Program. Due to the continuing need of local  
24 governments to address electronic or E-waste collection,  
25 1,500,000 has been added as a specific line item in the

1 Governor's proposed Fiscal Year 2003-2004 budget.

2 Cities, counties and other local agencies  
3 responsible for solid waste management are eligible to  
4 apply.

5 Staff proposes that a single jurisdiction can  
6 request up to \$200,000, and regional applicants covering  
7 more than one city and/or county can request up to  
8 \$300,000.

9 --o0o--

10 MR. GALLAGHER: The next overhead shows the HHW  
11 Grant award history for the last four cycles.

12 For HD 11, the previous HHW Grant cycle, there  
13 were 19 grant applications that passed, but could not be  
14 awarded due to the maximum funding limit of \$3 million at  
15 that time.

16 The general criteria for this grant reflects the  
17 Board's standardized criteria.

18 --o0o--

19 MR. GALLAGHER: The next overhead covers the  
20 statutory requirements and program specific criteria.

21 Statutory requirements. Public Resource Code  
22 Section 47200 states that preference shall be given to  
23 rural counties, small cities, and underserved populations.  
24 Preference shall also be given the regional or  
25 multi-jurisdictional programs. Twelve percent of the

1 total score is proposed for statutory required  
2 preferences.

3 Discretionary. Ten percent of the total score is  
4 proposed for not receiving the previous Household  
5 Hazardous Waste Grant Fiscal Year 2002-2003, which was the  
6 HD 11. The primary reason for this discretionary criteria  
7 was to recognize that in a previous grant cycle the 19  
8 grants received a passing score but were not able to be  
9 funded. All 19 of these passing get unfunded grants  
10 proposed programs to begin or expand electronic waste or  
11 universal U-waste collection programs.

12 Universal wastes are commonly generated in  
13 hazardous waste that can contain lead or mercury in  
14 products such as monitors, lamps, and batteries that are  
15 placed in a management system to encourage recycling.

16 Ten percent of the total scores also proposed for  
17 programs that establish or expand E-waste or U-waste  
18 collection programs. Based upon feedback from local  
19 governments, the overwhelming need they identified was for  
20 financial assistance in the area of E-waste and U-waste  
21 collection.

22 Scoring. Proposals must obtain a minimum of 70  
23 points out of the 100 possible points for funding.

24 In the event that there is insufficient funding  
25 for all qualified applicants, the highest ranked proposals

1 will have funding priority.

2 In conclusion, staff recommends Committee  
3 approval of Option 1 and adoption of Resolution Number  
4 2003-148.

5 Thank you. Are there any questions?

6 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Paparian.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Thank you, Mr.  
8 Chairman.

9 First of all I applaud you for, you know, calling  
10 out the E-waste and U-waste issue. I won't go into detail  
11 as to why, but I think it's a very important thing to do.

12 On this item there is not an environmental  
13 justice criteria. And I'm wondering if either we can add  
14 that or if there's a reason not to have it in the  
15 criteria?

16 MR. GALLAGHER: It is a requirement in the  
17 application to sign an environmental justice statement.  
18 So it's a yes or no. If they do not sign that, they're  
19 not eligible.

20 Also there is under the underserved criteria,  
21 which is part of the 12 percent of the total points, which  
22 would address environmental justice.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Where is that?

24 MR. GALLAGHER: If you look at the criteria, it  
25 is part of Criteria Number 8.



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Okay. So they could  
2 get 8 points for underserved pop --

3 MR. GALLAGHER: Correct.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I move to  
7 adopt Resolution 2003-148, consideration of the scoring  
8 criteria and evaluation process for the Fiscal Year  
9 2003-2004, Household Hazardous Waste Grant.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-148 has been  
12 moved by Board Member Washington, seconded by Board Member  
13 Jones.

14 Call the roll please.

15 SECRETARY HARRIS: Jones?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.

17 SECRETARY HARRIS: Paparian?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.

19 SECRETARY HARRIS: Washington?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Aye.

21 SECRETARY HARRIS: Medina?

22 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Aye.

23 And this item will be placed on the consent  
24 calendar.

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Committee Item F is

1 consideration of contractor for the evaluation of the  
2 Northern and Southern California Rubberized Asphalt  
3 Concrete Technology Centers Contract, Tire Recycling  
4 Management Fund, Fiscal Year 2002-2003.

5 Nate Gauff will make this presentation.

6 MR. GAUFF: Good morning, Chairman Medina and  
7 Board members. I'm Nate Gauff with the Special Waste  
8 Division.

9 This item is to consider the contract for  
10 evaluation of the Northern California and Southern  
11 California Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Technology Centers  
12 Contract. I'll give you a little background on this  
13 contract.

14 In November of 2001 the Board approved setting  
15 aside 25,000 from each technology center's allocation to  
16 fund an evaluation of the centers. That was 50,000 total  
17 for 2001-2002 fiscal year and also 50,000 from 2002-2003.

18 In January 2002, the Board approved the scope of  
19 work for the evaluation contract. In May of 2002 the  
20 staff issued a request for offer, to which we got no  
21 respondents, and subsequently lost the 50,000 -- or it was  
22 actually reallocated in June of 2002.

23 In September of 2002 the Board reallocated 50,000  
24 back into the contract funding. And in December of 2002  
25 the staff issued a second request for offer to 12

1 companies, of which we got four proposals back.

2           The four proposals were evaluated by staff  
3 according to the criteria for the contract. And we  
4 selected Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting LLC as the  
5 contractor, or as the proposed contractor.

6           Are there any questions?

7           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: I guess my question would  
8 be, do you have any information on the contractor? I have  
9 nothing here that identifies the contractor or anything  
10 about them.

11          MR. GAUFF: We transmitted that information. I  
12 think I gave it to Amalia yesterday. It was a little  
13 profile on the company.

14          If you have any questions, I can attempt to  
15 answer them.

16          CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board member Jones, then  
17 Washington.

18          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Just a quick question.

19          As they're doing the evaluation, if it's -- we  
20 had had this conversation once before at a committee  
21 meeting -- they need to look at making our RAC centers  
22 available, or think about evaluating making our RAC  
23 centers available to some of the surrounding states,  
24 because it is our crumb rubber that is looking for markets  
25 with rubberized asphalt. And every once in a while

1 there's a request to get experts out of Oregon. I've gone  
2 up to Oregon. I've gone to other places. We need to at  
3 least -- through this process at least have a little  
4 discussion I think about the feasibility, does it make  
5 sense, would it make a positive impact into the crumb  
6 rubber generated in the state? It would enlarge our  
7 markets. So I think we ought to at least think about that  
8 being something to evaluate as part of the audit, if it  
9 would be reasonable -- if it seems reasonable.

10 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Any other comments?

11 Board Member Washington, Board Member Paparian.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I guess this is for  
13 Mr. Lee or whoever wants to come and answer this question.  
14 In terms of the requests for offer, I heard him say that  
15 you guys offered to 12 companies; is that correct?

16 MR. GAUFF: I can answer that.

17 Yeah, what we did, we used the master services  
18 agreement process through the Department of General  
19 Services, and we just selected 12 companies --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: So a request for  
21 offers, that means you can go to different companies and  
22 offer this service to them?

23 MR. GAUFF: Well, no. What we did is we selected  
24 12 companies off of that master services agreement list.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I got you.

1 MR. GAUFF: -- and asked for them to solicit a  
2 proposal back.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board member Paparian.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Thank you, Mr.  
6 Chairman.

7 And thank you, Nate, for pursuing this. I know  
8 it's been a struggle on this one. But I think it will be  
9 a good thing that comes out of this. I think Mr. Jones  
10 suggestion is a good one. I think a part of the purpose  
11 of this whole thing is to assure that we take the already  
12 good RAC centers and look at ways to make them even better  
13 in the future and provide us some advice on that.

14 So if it's all right, Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to  
15 move the item. I'd like to move resolution 2003-147,  
16 filling in the blanks with the Sjoberg Evashenk name and  
17 the \$100,000.

18 MR. GAUFF: Actually the amount of their bid was  
19 \$97,340.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Okay. With that  
21 amount put in there and the Sjoberg Evashenk name going in  
22 the right spot, I move Resolution 2003-147.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-147 has been  
25 moved by Board Member Paparian, seconded by Board Member

1 Jones.

2 Substitute the previous roll call.

3 And this will go on consent.

4 MR. GAUFF: Thank you.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Committee Item G, it's  
6 consideration of adoption of revisions to the existing  
7 Waste Tire Hauler Registration and Manifesting  
8 Regulations.

9 Keith Cambridge will make the presentation.

10 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
11 Presented as follows.)

12 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Good morning, Mr. Chair, members  
13 of the Committee. My name is Keith Cambridge of the Waste  
14 Tire Hauler Program.

15 I will be presenting today the following item:  
16 Consideration of adoption of revisions to the existing  
17 Waste Tire Hauler Registration and Manifesting  
18 Regulations.

19 --oOo--

20 MR. CAMBRIDGE: At the October 2nd, 2002, Special  
21 Waste and Market Development Committee meeting, staff  
22 presented the proposed changes to the Waste Tire Hauler  
23 Registration and Manifesting Regulations. Staff was  
24 directed by the Committee to publicly notice these  
25 proposed regulations, which was done on December 6th,

1 2002, and ended on January 27th, 2003.

2           During that time period -- during that comment  
3 period staff received one comment letter from the City of  
4 San Diego LEA.

5           At the February 4th, 2003, Special Waste and  
6 Market Development Committee meeting, a public hearing was  
7 held for this 45-day comment period. No additional  
8 comments were received.

9           The Committee directed staff to conduct an  
10 additional 15-day comment period for these regulations.  
11 This 15-day comment period started on February 6th and  
12 went through February 21st, 2003. No comments were  
13 received during the public time period. However, staff  
14 did receive one comment letter a week later from the  
15 County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services  
16 concerning some minor grammatical changes. In addition,  
17 staff received some minor few comments on radical changes  
18 from the Legal Office and put those changes into the  
19 regulations and are noted in your agenda item.

20                               --o0o--

21           MR. CAMBRIDGE: In general, the revisions to the  
22 existing Waste Tire Hauler Regulation and Manifesting  
23 Regulations pertain to exemptions, definitions,  
24 applications, the procedures.

25                               --o0o--

1           MR. CAMBRIDGE: Staff is recommending Option 1,  
2 that the Board find the proposed regulations an exempt  
3 from the CEQA process requirements and approve the  
4 proposed regulations for adoption, directing staff to  
5 complete the rulemaking process with the Office of  
6 Administrative Law, and adopt Resolution 2003-145.

7           This concludes my presentation. Are there any  
8 questions?

9           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Thank you.

10          Board members, any questions or discussions on  
11 this item?

12          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

13          CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Jones.

14          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: On this one only, I'll  
15 move that it's exempt from CEQA. That may not be the case  
16 on other ones. And that we approve Resolution 2003-145,  
17 consideration of the adoption of the revisions to the  
18 existing Waste Tire Hauler Registration and Manifesting  
19 Regulations.

20          CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: In regards to it being  
21 exempt from CEQA, how do you work that in there?

22          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Is it part of this --  
23 Kathryn Tobias, is it part of this agenda that it be  
24 exempt?

25          CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: You know, I'm looking at



1 the staff report on page 6-6, and it says that we  
2 determined it's exempt from CEQA.

3 But, Keith, I don't remember what exemption we  
4 used.

5 MR. CAMBRIDGE: A categorical exemption that we  
6 used.

7 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: A categorical exemption.  
8 So this is not saying that it's exempt from CEQA  
9 completely. It's saying that this is a -- I think we  
10 probably used the categorical exemption of improvements to  
11 the environment.

12 It's always confusing when we say exempt without  
13 citing what that exemption is. And that should have been  
14 made more clear.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And I can say as part of  
16 my motion.

17 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: Yes, because -- when you  
18 do an exemption you don't have to do the same findings  
19 that you do with a Negative Declaration and an EIR. So as  
20 long as it says it in the resolution, which Mark is  
21 whispering to me that it does, then that should be okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Is there a second on this  
24 motion?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

1           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-145 has been  
2 moved by Board Member Jones, seconded by Board Member  
3 Washington.

4           Substitute the previous roll call, unless there's  
5 any other vote on this.

6           Okay. This will be placed on the consent  
7 calendar.

8           With that we will be taking a break at this time.  
9 And we shall return at 11 o'clock.

10          (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

11          CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: This meeting is called back  
12 to order. And we're going to begin with Item C.

13          Do we have a resolution on Item C, Mr. Lee?

14          DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Yes, Chairman Medina.

15          Staff has an additional modification that we'd  
16 like to propose for the Committee's consideration.

17          First of all, again I would just like to state  
18 again that, you know, this grant program is significantly  
19 undersubscribed. And staff is very reluctant to recommend  
20 to the Committee that they consider additional  
21 requirements that might further reduce participation.

22          Then historically, on another point, in our grant  
23 application criteria, we have always added points to those  
24 grantees that have not received previous grants rather  
25 than subtracting points from those grantees that did

1 receive a grant. So we felt that this practice has worked  
2 well in the past.

3           However, in considering the comments made by  
4 Committee Member Jones and Committee Member Washington,  
5 staff would like to propose a conditional program  
6 criteria, which would be triggered only in the event that  
7 we have more passing applications than funding available.  
8 If this case presents itself, we would propose to add 5  
9 points to those applicants that have not received an  
10 Amnesty Day grant within the last two years.

11           We would like the Committee to consider that and  
12 see if that meets with your approval.

13           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Committee members.

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: That works for me, Mr.  
15 Chair.

16           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, that's fine.

17           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: All Board members in  
18 agreement on that one, and so we'll move forward with  
19 that.

20           DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Committee Member  
21 Medina.

22           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Did we move this resolution  
23 already?

24           DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: It wasn't voted on.

25           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Call the roll then.

1 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: Well, I think you might  
2 want to restate the motion just because you've got new  
3 information, and then I think Mr. Jones was trying to deal  
4 with it in an amendment. So if you just want to restate  
5 your motion to reflect --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I move  
7 adoption of Resolution 2003-144, consideration of the  
8 proposed applicant eligibility, project eligibility,  
9 scoring criteria, and evaluation process for the Local  
10 Government Public Education and Amnesty Day Grant Program,  
11 Fiscal Year 2003-2004 with the --

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: -- conditional program  
13 criteria.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second.

16 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Okay. Resolution 2003-144  
17 has been moved an seconded with the appropriate  
18 modifications.

19 Call the roll on that.

20 SECRETARY HARRIS: Jones?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Aye.

22 SECRETARY HARRIS: Paparian?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.

24 SECRETARY HARRIS: Washington?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Aye.

1 SECRETARY HARRIS: Medina?

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Aye.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair, would that  
5 appropriate for consent?

6 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yes. That would be placed  
7 on consent.

8 With that we'll move on to Item I.

9 And the Waste Prevention and Market Development  
10 Deputy Director's report.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Good morning, Chairman  
12 Medina and Committee members. Patty Wohl with the Waste  
13 Prevention and Market Development Division.

14 I'd just like to mention a couple zone activities  
15 that are occurring in the near future. There's going to  
16 be a loan eligibility workshop on April 8th here in the  
17 building. And that will be to work with the zone  
18 administrators and get their input on the loan eligibility  
19 criteria that we'll be bringing forward to the board in  
20 June or July.

21 In addition, the zone administrator training will  
22 be April 9th, also here. That's in an attempt to  
23 facilitate their attendance at the trade show on the 10th.

24 So I think several of the Board members and the  
25 Committee members will be attending. Mr. Medina, Mr.

1 Jones, and Mr. Washington have agreed to participate in  
2 those workshops. So we look forward to your  
3 participation.

4 And with that I'll just move into Agenda Item J.

5 Agenda Item J is consideration of the Recycling  
6 Market Development Revolving Loan Program application for  
7 Golden By-products, Inc., d.b.a. Scrap Tire Company.

8 And Jim La Tanner will present this item and  
9 Agenda Item K.

10 MR. La TANNER: Jim La Tanner, Supervisor for the  
11 Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program.

12 Committee Item J, Board Agenda Item Number 8.

13 This item requests the Board's approval of Golden  
14 By-products application to the RMDZ Loan Program that are  
15 requesting \$1,375,000 to purchase equipment, fund working  
16 capital, and pay off onerous debt.

17 The project is located in Bellico, California,  
18 within the Merced County Regional RMDZ.

19 The Loan Committee will meet on March 13th to  
20 consider staff's analysis of Golden By-products, Inc.,  
21 loan application, the ability to repay and collateralize  
22 the loan. The results will be presented at the March  
23 18-19 Board meeting.

24 As a result of this loan this project is  
25 projected to divert an additional 12,000 tons of tires per

1 year, equating to a total annual diversion of 26,000 tons.  
2 Golden By-products currently employs 45 people. This  
3 project is projected to create an additional 15 jobs,  
4 equating to a total of 60 employees.

5           There's one correction in the agenda item. On  
6 page 5, under "Funding Information," the text above the  
7 table. This item, being tires, will be funded entirely  
8 from the Tire Fund, not from the RMDZ. There is 2 million  
9 allocated to the loan program this year, and there's  
10 sufficient amount to refund this.

11           With that staff recommends Board approval of  
12 Option 1, to adopt Resolution 2003-192, to approve an RMDZ  
13 loan to Golden By-products in the amount of 1,375,000.

14           Two representatives from the company are in the  
15 audience, should a Board member have a question -- Karen  
16 Barstow, the CFO; and Jenna Norin, the Corporate  
17 Secretary.

18           That concludes my presentation.

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

20           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington and  
21 then Board Member Jones.

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Did I just hear you  
23 correct? Did you say that you guys we're going -- when  
24 did you say you're going to meet to see if they meet the  
25 criteria?

1           MR. La TANNER: The Loan Committee -- we have a  
2 separate Loan Committee that will meet this Thursday at 10  
3 o'clock. They consider the borrower's ability to repay  
4 and collateralize the loan. They review staff's analysis.  
5 What we've done in the past is Loan Committee --

6           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah -- and I guess  
7 I'm just trying to figure out why are we approving this if  
8 the Loan Committee hasn't given you their -- I mean no  
9 dispersion on the company. I'm just trying to figure out  
10 how you guys -- it sounds like to me you're going  
11 backwards. You're going to approve something and then  
12 you're going to see if they meet that requirement.

13           Am I correct?

14           MR. La TANNER: Yeah, what we've done in the past  
15 is -- Loan Committee meets after this. If for any reason  
16 Loan Committee disapproves a loan or approves it with  
17 conditions, then when we get to the Board meeting we would  
18 pull it off consent and we note the changes for Board  
19 consideration.

20           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Well, why would you  
21 do them like that? Why wouldn't you try and take care of  
22 that before --

23           MR. La TANNER: We have a problem in scheduling  
24 the Loan Committee to occur before the Special Waste  
25 Committee, because it would have to occur two weeks



1 earlier than this because none of the Loan Committee's  
2 available at the end of the month.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: So who makes up  
4 this Loan Committee?

5 MR. La TANNER: The Loan Committee is comprised  
6 of nine people through volunteers throughout the state.  
7 Half work for perhaps a private industry bank, half work  
8 for local government in some lending capacity. It gives  
9 the Board an outside opinion of staff's analysis of the  
10 borrower's ability to prepay and collateralize the loan.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Well, I also need  
12 to talk to Patty later about this. I mean I just think  
13 that's kind of going business backwards. Maybe we need to  
14 figure out how to set a schedule where these items come  
15 before this Committee or the Board, that the Committee set  
16 up and kind of go through these things and try to knock  
17 them so you don't have to sit here and approve something.  
18 And then if something comes up at the Board -- to me it  
19 sounds like oxymoron type of stuff. You approve  
20 something -- I mean what's going on here? I mean --

21 MR. La TANNER: If the Board were to make change,  
22 the Loan Committee would have to meet at least two weeks  
23 prior to this, which would make it almost a two-month  
24 process. And we ought to have the staff's analysis  
25 finished before the loan is actually approved. So it

1 takes our approval process into four months.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Jones.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I can appreciate Member  
6 Washington's issues. We had the same issues before. And  
7 what we -- the staff work -- because a lot these people  
8 are former bankers, make sure that they meet all criteria,  
9 and then when the loan office -- these are folks that run  
10 banks and stuff that review to make sure. And it's our  
11 way of getting that extra set of eyes looking at it.

12 But every time we've done one of these, we  
13 predicate the resolution on approval by the Loan  
14 Committee.

15 So I'm going to move this resolution. But I'm  
16 going to say that I'll move it predicated on the approval  
17 by the Loan Committee, which will happen prior to the  
18 Board meeting?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I'll second it.  
20 You certainly didn't have to say -- I mean I just wanted  
21 to raise that to figure out why we're doing it that way.  
22 That's all.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, it's a valid  
24 point, and that's how we've done it.

25 Mr. Chair, I'll move adoption of Resolution

1 2003-192, consideration of the Recycling Market  
2 Development Revolving Loan Program application for the  
3 Golden By-products, Inc., doing business as Scrap tire  
4 company, predicated on the outcome -- conditioned on the  
5 outcome of the approval of the Loan Committee, which will  
6 be held on March 13th.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-192 has been  
9 moved and seconded.

10 Substitute the previous roll call.

11 MR. La TANNER: Committee Item K, Agenda Item 9,  
12 presents for Board approval of Electronic Partners  
13 Corporation to the RMDZ Loan program. The company's  
14 requesting 700,000 to purchase E-waste processing  
15 equipment to fund working capital and loan fees. The  
16 project is located in Los Angeles, which is in the City  
17 Los Angeles RMDZ.

18 Again, the Loan Committee will meet on March 13th  
19 and the results will be presented.

20 As a result of this project, it projects to  
21 divert an additional 4,000 tons of E-waste in the first  
22 year of operation and 15,000 tons when the facility is at  
23 full capacity in three years. The project is projected to  
24 create an additional 200 new jobs.

25 Staff recommends that the Board approve Option 1

1 and adopt Resolution 2003-193, to approve the RMDZ loan to  
2 Electronic Partners Corporation in the amount of 700,000.

3 A representative from the company, Dan Burgess,  
4 the Chairman, CEO, and President, is available if the  
5 Board members have any questions.

6 That concludes my presentation.

7 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Thank you.

8 Board Member Paparian.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Quick question.

10 The material that goes out for recycling after  
11 it's processed, what is the disposition of that material?  
12 Does it -- where does it go? Does it go --

13 MR. La TANNER: Let me invite Dan Burgess up  
14 here.

15 MR. BURGESS: Dan Burgess, Electronic Partners  
16 Corporations.

17 Our process is a gradation and separation  
18 technique, which allows us to get homogeneous streams of  
19 fiberglass, metals, plastics into homogeneous straight,  
20 which would go back to either metal consumers such as  
21 smelters, refiners or plastics recyclers in various  
22 finished good forms that are available in marketplace, and  
23 that create pellets or other material products that can go  
24 into finished goods, or to glass manufacturers for the  
25 glass and fiberglass components.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Okay. I'll ask you  
2 about some details of that separately.

3 Okay. Thank you.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Jones.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll move adoption OF  
7 resolution 2003-193, the consideration of the Recycling  
8 Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application for  
9 Electronic Partners Corporation, conditioned on the  
10 approval of the Loan Committee meeting on March 13th 2003.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-193 has been  
13 moved, conditional on -- what was that meeting?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: On Loan Committee March  
15 13th, 2003.

16 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Very good.

17 Substitute the previous roll call?

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: So I'm assuming both J and  
19 K are fiscal consent?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Unless there's a  
21 problem.

22 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yes, they are, again  
23 conditional on the Loan Committee's approval.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Yeah, got it.

25 Agenda Item L. --

1 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Excuse me.

2 Board Member Jones.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Just real quickly before  
4 all these loan folks leave. As Mr. Paparian and Mr.  
5 Medina -- Chair Medina remember, we were working on our  
6 leveraging activity for the RMDZ to try to keep this  
7 alive. We have to be a little smart about it because we  
8 don't want the Legislature sweeping it. So we've got to  
9 be a little bit smart on how were going to do that.

10 I do want to let the members, including Mr.  
11 Washington, know in public that one of the people that we  
12 insisted on to help us with that project, Victor Hoskins,  
13 who came to us from Baltimore to actually shepherd a  
14 report through Milken and work as a liaison between the  
15 Board staff, was appointed as the Secretary of Housing and  
16 Community Development for Markets for the State of  
17 Maryland. I hear California RMDZ associate members not  
18 have much high regard for Mr. Hoskins as well as others.  
19 And I want to tell you, that leveraging thing didn't  
20 happen unless we were comfortable. And we were  
21 comfortable with Mr. Hoskins in that roll. And I want  
22 members to know that, because that's the kind of quality  
23 we get at this Board, members, somebody that can appointed  
24 to a secretary position.

25 I think that says a lot for our ability to draw

1 in the very best to help us with projects. And I just  
2 wanted to congratulate Victor and let the members know the  
3 kind of quality people that are out there.

4 Thanks, Mr. Chair. Appreciate it.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: So noted.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. Agenda Item L,  
7 consideration of the application to renew the Oroville  
8 Recycling Market Development Zone Designation.

9 And this will be presented by Steve Boyd.

10 MR. BOYD: Steve Boyd, Recycling Market  
11 Development Zone Program. Good morning, Chairman Medina  
12 and Committee members.

13 This item requests your consideration and  
14 approval of the City of Oroville's application to renew  
15 their RMDZ designation.

16 As you heard, RMDZ designations were granted for  
17 a period of 10 years, and Oroville's redesignation request  
18 is one of six coming before you this morning.

19 The interesting part of working in the recycling  
20 Market Development Zone Program --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: One second.

22 Your presentation is so good --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair, the work that  
24 our staff has done to prepare these, I'm prepared to move  
25 adoption of Resolution 2003-194, consideration of

1 application to renew the Oroville Recycling Market  
2 Development Zone Designation.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Thank you, Board Member  
5 Jones, and thank you, Board Member Paparian, for moving  
6 this along.

7 And Resolution 2003-194 has been moved and  
8 seconded.

9 Substitute the previous roll call.

10 And we'll move on to the next item.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And that one will be on  
12 consent?

13 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: It will.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. Agenda Item M, it's  
15 pulled.

16 Agenda Item N, consideration of the application  
17 to renew the Merced County Regional Recycling Market  
18 Development Zone designation.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yes.

22 I have a mover and a second --

23 (Laughter.)

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I'd like to move  
25 Resolution 2003-196, consideration of application to renew



1 the Merced County Regional Recycling Market Development  
2 Zone designation.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-196 has been  
5 moved by Board Member Washington, seconded by Board Member  
6 Jones.

7 Substitute the previous roll call.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Agenda Item O,  
9 consideration of the application to renew the South San  
10 Diego Recycling Market Development Zone designation.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chair.

12 (Laughter.)

13 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

14 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: Chairman Medina.

15 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yes.

16 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: It's hard to look over  
17 here.

18 If you want to do these as a group, I think you  
19 could do the next couple agenda items together if you want  
20 to.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Excellent.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: So it's Agenda Item O, P,  
23 Q, R -- that's it -- are all redesignations.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And can I move  
25 these as those item numbers?

1 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: That's correct.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

3 Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I'd like to move

6 Agenda Item 14, Agenda Item 15, Agenda Item 16.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And 13.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And 13.

10 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Very good.

11 Will we need the resolution numbers on those?

12 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: I think it's okay for the  
13 Committee meeting.

14 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Okay. Agenda items -- if  
15 you would name those again please.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Agenda Item 13,  
17 Agenda Item 14, Agenda Item 15, and Agenda Item 16.

18 CHIEF COUNSEL TOBIAS: That's O through R.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: O through R.

20 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Agenda Items O through R  
21 have been moved by Board Member Washington.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Seconded by Board Member  
24 Jones.

25 Substitute the previous roll call.

1           DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL:  Agenda Item S is  
2   consideration of the scope of work for the RecyclingStore  
3   Marketing Services Contract.

4           And Steve Boyd's available if you have any  
5   questions.

6           (Laughter.)

7           MR. BOYD:  You're not getting rid of me that  
8   easy, guys.

9           DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL:  He's back.

10          MR. BOYD:  Again, Steve Boyd, Recycling Market  
11   Development Zone Program.  And again good morning,  
12   Chairman and Committee members.  I'll make this brief.

13          The item requests consideration and approval of  
14   the scope of work for RecycleStore Dot Com Marketing  
15   Services.  Your RecycleStore project began in 1998 after  
16   manufacturers in my rural recycling zones identified  
17   recycle content product marketing as one of their biggest  
18   barriers to successful business.

19          Through two development contracts and a  
20   considerable amount of IMD and RMDZ staff effort,  
21   recycleStore currently contains approximately 350 recycled  
22   content product pages.  And it's growing with new products  
23   from our recycling zones almost on a weekly basis.

24          The same need for marketing services that the  
25   manufacturers experienced is now facing RecycleStore Dot

1 Com. The project has achieved success through our own  
2 marketing efforts that are somewhat limited by policy and  
3 resources.

4 To further increase manufacturer sales and the  
5 resulting increase in recycled material diversion, a  
6 recycleStore marketing effort needs to be designed and  
7 implemented by a professional marketing firm. This scope  
8 of work seeks the ideas of marketing firms to introduce  
9 recycleStore on a nationwide basis to three target  
10 audiences identified by Board staff.

11 Those targets are buyers for retail  
12 merchandisers, government procurement officials, and the  
13 general public.

14 Additional target identification and the contact  
15 process that would reach these folks is encouraged in the  
16 scope of work.

17 Staff recommends adoption of Option 1 and the  
18 adoption of Resolution 2003-201.

19 And I'd be glad to answer any questions you might  
20 have.

21 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board members.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Jones.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I have just a concern.

25 I don't know if we're going a little bit too deep when we

1 identify three different categories of people. I mean  
2 this marketing plan can't just be about developing a  
3 website. We've got to learn something from the crash or  
4 the difficulty in the electronic marketing that's hit the  
5 stock market. I think our biggest goal has to be how do  
6 we get people to these sites?

7 And I don't think that's a major consideration.  
8 Because if we're going to spend this money just to enhance  
9 a website that nobody visits, then it's a waste of time  
10 and effort. And I just hope that we learn from what's  
11 going on around us, and that's getting people to the  
12 sites.

13 MR. BOYD: Yeah, we fully agree. And that's the  
14 intent of the contract, is to have these professional  
15 marketing firms tell us what they would do in order to get  
16 RecycleStore Dot Com in front of the nation.

17 We focused on the three target audiences just as  
18 a basis for people that are currently buying. They  
19 represent the demographics of a current RecycleStore  
20 customer. But the intent is is to through news releases,  
21 getting on morning talk shows, Martha Stewart, or whatever  
22 these people think they can do with the limited funds we  
23 have available, that's what we're looking for.

24 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Paparian.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: When they look at

1 this, will they look at options like -- what would you  
2 call it? -- co-branding or -- looking at -- developing  
3 relationships with other existing more successful  
4 websites?

5 MR. BOYD: That could be. You know, that's why  
6 we actually called for proposals here in the sense that,  
7 you know, we had some ideas of our own, but we really  
8 wanted to see what they would recommend.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Some of the stuff  
10 I've read indicates that when people are offered a  
11 multiple services, sometimes those are the more successful  
12 web-based sites.

13 I'm not saying that's the way to go. I'm saying  
14 it's something that ought to be considered.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board Member Washington.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I'd like to move  
18 adoption of Resolution 2003-201, consideration of the  
19 scope of work for the RecycleStore Marketing Services  
20 Contract, Fiscal Year 2002-2003, Contract Concept Number  
21 14.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-201 has been  
24 by Board Member Washington, seconded by Board Member  
25 Paparian.

1           Substitute the previous roll call.

2           DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL:   Okay.   Agenda Item T,  
3   consideration of completion of 1997 through 1999 Rigid  
4   Plastic Packaging Container (RPPC) Compliance Agreements  
5   for the following companies.   And there's a list of 23.

6           And Jan Howard will present.

7           MS. HOWARD:   Good morning, Committee Chair Medina  
8   and Committee members.

9           First I'd like to clarify that we're only going  
10   forward this month with 22 companies.   Foam Seal, as  
11   included in the title, will be heard at the June Board  
12   meeting.   And I'd also like to clarify that John Deere  
13   Consumer Products, Incorporated, should be included under  
14   Option 5.

15           So with that we are -- staff recommends the  
16   Committee approve the 24 companies, 12 of them under  
17   Option 1, 1 for Option 2, 6 for Option 4, 3 for Option 5;  
18   and ask that the Committee adopt Resolutions 2003-202  
19   through 2003-212 and 2003-214 flew 2003-224.

20           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES:   Mr. Chair.

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON:   I'm confused.

22           (Laughter.)

23           CHAIRPERSON MEDINA:   Board Member Jones.

24           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES:   I'll move adoption of  
25   Resolutions 2003-202 through 212 and 2003-214 through 224.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I can tell  
2 you've been doing this a lot, Steve.

3 (Laughter.)

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I'll second it.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution Number 2003-202,  
6 through Resolution 2003-212 and Resolution Number 2003-214  
7 through Resolution 224 has been moved and seconded.

8 Substitute the previous roll call.

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And that one will be on  
10 consent.

11 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: That will be on consent.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Agenda Item U, which is  
13 Board Item 19, consideration of adoption of emergency  
14 regulations regarding assessment of administrative civil  
15 penalties against product manufacturers for noncompliance  
16 with the Rigid Plastic Packaging Container (RPPC) Law.

17 And Bill Orr will present.

18 MR. ORR: Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Before we move forward on  
20 the presentation on this, Board members, because of the  
21 importance of this particular item, my inclination is to  
22 move it to the full Board for discussion.

23 So would you like to hear the presentation now or  
24 would you rather have the full Board here this  
25 presentation and take action on this matter?



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It's okay for me to go  
2 to the full Board.

3 I've got some problems with this, so I'll give  
4 you a heads up.

5 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Okay. I'm going to be  
6 moving this item to the full Board for discussion then.  
7 We will not take a vote on it at this time. And we will  
8 here a full presentation from the staff at that particular  
9 time.

10 I do have some people that are here though that  
11 wish to speak on this item. So I'm going to afford them  
12 the opportunity to speak. And they are in this order:  
13 Randy Pollack and Bill Krauss.

14 Are there any other speakers on this subject? If  
15 so, please pass in the speakers slips to Ms. Harris on the  
16 left.

17 MR. POLLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of  
18 the Committee. I will also delay my remarks to the full  
19 Board till next week, and also Bill Krauss will delay his  
20 remarks also.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Wonderful.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: You can see how  
24 Randy's been around the Legislature.

25 (Laughter.)

1 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Any other -- how many items  
2 do we have remaining?

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Just one -- one last one.

4 Agenda Item V, which is consideration of the  
5 Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Task Force Charter  
6 pursuant to Assembly Bill 498.

7 And Roberta Kunisaki will present.

8 MS. KUNISAKI: Goods morning, Chairman Medina and  
9 distinguished Committee members. My name's Roberta  
10 Kunisaki. I'm with the Waste prevention and Market  
11 Development Unit.

12 I'm pleased to submit our Agenda Item V to you  
13 this morning for consideration of the Environmentally  
14 Preferable Purchasing Program Charter. This charter is  
15 the beginning of the implementation of Assembly Bill 498  
16 (Chan), the environmentally preferred purchasing bill.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Board member Paparian.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'm familiar with  
20 this work. And staff's doing a wonderful job on this and  
21 working in conjunction with other agencies. And I'm  
22 prepared to move it, if you'd like.

23 I'll move resolution 2003-226.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second.

25 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Resolution 2003-226 has been

1 moved an seconded.

2 Substitute the previous roll call.

3 And thank you very much for your presentation.

4 And thanks to the staff.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And that one will also be  
6 on consent.

7 CHAIRPERSON MEDINA: Yes.

8 That concludes all the items on our agenda,  
9 unless there are any public speakers.

10 Any members that wish to speak?

11 If not, this meeting is adjourned.

12 (Thereupon the California Integrated  
13 Waste Management Board, Special Waste  
14 and Market Development Committee  
15 adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand  
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered  
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the  
6 foregoing California Integrated Waste Management Board,  
7 Special Waste and Market Development Committee meeting was  
8 reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified  
9 Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and  
10 thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
12 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any  
13 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
15 this 3rd day of April, 2003.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR  
24 Certified Shorthand Reporter  
25 License No. 10063